# **EXHIBIT 2**

THIRD JUDICIAL COURT

1		12 JUN - 6 AM 11: 16
2	STA	ATE OF MICHEGAN OF TING
3	IN THE CIRCUIT COU	ATE OF MICHEGANOF  COURT REPORTING  RT FOR THEVILODIVISION WAYNE
4	JEROME MOORE,	
5	Plaintiff,	
6	-VS-	Case No. 10 006 409 CD
7	SOUTHEASTERN MICHIGAN HEALTH	
8	ASSOCIATION,	
9	Defendant.	
10	/	
11	MOTION HEARING	
12	Friday, May 11, 2012, Detroit, Michigan	
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE AMY P. HATHAWAY, CIRCUIT JUDGE	
14	APPEARANCES:	
15	For the Plaintiff:	EDWARDS & JENNINGS, P.C.
16		Alice B. Jennings (229064)
17		65 Cadillac Square, Rm. 2710
18		Detroit, MI 48226
19		(313) 961-5000
20	For the Defendant,	
21	SEMHA:	NEMETH BURWELL, P.C.
22		Terry Bonnette (P67692)
23		200 Talon Centre, Ste. 200
24		Detroit, MI 48226
25		(313) 567-5921

```
1
2 APPEARANCES: (cont'd)
3
  Appearing for the City of
                               CITY OF DETROIT LAW
 4
   Detroit:
                                 DEPARTMENT
 5
                                Andrew Jarvis (P59191)
 6
                                 660 Woodward Ave. #1650
 7
                                Detroit, MI 48226
 8
                                 (313) 237-5038
 9
                  TABLE OF CONTENTS
10
11
12
   WITNESSES:
13
14
15
       (none)
16 EXHIBITS:
17
18
            (none)
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

21

```
was reinstated in September is of 2008. And
         then terminated again in February, of 2009.
               He worked there for 13 months. He was
3
         hired obviously as a black man, at a certain
4
          age, which we won't go into, Mr. Moore, and 13
5
         months later, he says he was fired because of
 6
          his race and his age. That's the first problem
7
          we have to get over. Let's deal with the city
 8
          of Detroit.
 9
               First of all, the Court is satisfied that
10
          there are questions of fact whether the
11
          defendant city is an agent to apply under ELCRA
12
          or whether it controlled a term, condition or
13
          privilege of a nonemployee. That's the
14
          McClemmons (phonetic) case that Miss Jennings
15
          cited. And given the city's employment,
16
          management and working relationship with
17
          defendant SEMHA, especially in this case,
18
          because of the two employees, I believe they
19
          were King and Gregory; is that correct?
2.0
               MS. JENNINGS: That's correct.
21
               THE COURT: The Court is satisfied there
22
          are questions of fact as to what control they
23
          had over defendant employees relationship. So
24
          for purposes of all these decisions that I have
25
```

22

to make, I'm going to address all counts to 1 both defendants. 2 I've already made a preliminary statement 3 regarding race and sex. 4 With respect to age discrimination, the 5 Court is satisfied that the comments that were 6 made were insufficient to get a claim for age 7 discrimination. There is no evidence that 8 satisfies this Court that the plaintiff was 9 treated differently. The comments do not go 10 directly to discriminate his age, but simply 11 that they were stray remarks as the defendant 12 calls them and the Court is satisfied that he 13 was not treated differently for the same or 14 similar conduct. 15

The defendant shows that the plaintiff was 16 terminated for not providing a quality product, 17 or not having the ability or understanding 18 necessary for the job. That's the memo from 19 King, which is March, 2009. But there's 20 nothing to establish that the alleged similarly 21 situated employees, which is required, were 22 performing their work unsatisfactory, or were 23 kept on anyway. The only real instance 24 plaintiff points to is McClainor, but she 25

# **EXHIBIT 3**

### MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS

Schedule of Arguments - MCR 7.213(D)

#### Wednesday, November 13, 2013 at 11:00 AM

Detroit Courtroom, 3020 West Grand Boulevard, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor, Detroit Karen M Fort Hood, PJ, and Henry William Saad and Stephen L Borrello, JJ

JEROME D GOLDBERG 2921 E JEFFERSON AVE STE 205 DETROIT, MI 48207 Case Call Item 10

Mailed: October 4, 2013

COA.299 MID MICHIGAN DIAGNOSTIC CORP V MICHIGAN INTERNAL MEDICINE 307320-T\* PCAttorneys **DENNIS K EGAN Oral Argument Preserved** PL-CD-AT DONALD H ROBERTSON Oral Argument Preserved DF-CP-AE MID-MICHIGAN DIAGNOSTIC CORP V MICHIGAN INTERNAL MEDICINE 9 307863-T\* PC Attorneys JOVAN DRAGOVIC Oral Argument Preserved PL-CD-AE **DENNIS K EGAN Oral Argument Preserved** PL-CD-AE DONALD H ROBERTSON Oral Argument Preserved DF-CP-AT JEROME MOORE V SOUTHEASTERN MICHIGAN HEALTH ASSOCIATION 10 310920-D Attorneys ALICE B JENNINGS Oral Argument Preserved PL-AT JEROME D GOLDBERG Oral Argument Preserved PL-AT DEBORAH L BROUWER Oral Argument Preserved DF-AE JASON MCFARLANE Oral Argument Preserved DF-AE STEPHEN J DUNN V TIMOTHY M BENNETT 11 311357-T Attorneys STEPHEN J DUNN PL-AE-XT KEVIN L BENNETT Oral Argument Preserved DF-AT-XE IN RE L VANNESTE MINOR 315867-T# 12 Attorneys ΑE SAMANTHA A LORD TIMOTHY K MORRIS PT-AE BRANDON MCNAMEE Oral Argument Preserved RS-AT

*NOTE:* The tables in the courtrooms are reserved for counsel or parties *in propria persona* who are endorsed to present oral argument. The tables are not to be occupied by parties or amici curiae who are not endorsed.

# EXHIBIT 3

#### UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

IN RE:	Chapter 9 Case No. 13-53846
City of Detroit, Michigan,	
Debtor.	

### PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY

This Motion having come before this Court on Motion of Jerome Moore, and the Court being otherwise advised on the premises:

#### IT IS ORDERED:

- 1. Jerome Moore's Motion for limited Relief from the Automatic Stay is granted.
- 2. The Automatic Stay is lifted for the limited purpose of allowing the City of Detroit to participate in Oral Argument in Mr. Moore's appeal, Michigan Court of Appeals No. 310-920 scheduled to be heard on November 13, 2013 and to allow for the Court of Appeals to render its decision on the Appeal.
- 3. If the Appeal is granted and the case is remanded for further proceedings to Wayne County Circuit Court, any further adjudication relative to the City of Detroit shall be subject to the automatic stay and to the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court.